



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tract "How the office of Curates is ordained of God." The language of this tract is quite as uncompromising as that with which he assailed the abuses of mendicancy. Many of the secular clergy of those days, if we are to believe the Reformer, were infamous for ostentation, sensuality, and avarice. Their doctrine was no better than their example. "They taught," he says, "sinful men to buy hell full dear." They maintained their influence by an impious prostitution of the power of the keys, and extorted, by the terror of their spiritual censures, the money and the obedience of their enslaved congregations." In some instances the parish priests entered into an unholy partnership with the objects of their secret jealousy and hate, the itinerant friars and pardoners." "For when there cometh a pardoner to rich places, with stolen bulls and false reliques, granting more years of pardon than come before doomsday, for gaining worldly wealth, he shall be received of curates, to have a part of that which he getteth." This tract was one of Wycliffe's latest performances; and it proves, that every day he lived only gave additional keenness to his perception of the evils which overran the Church, and additional intensity to his desire for their correction.

We have intentionally avoided all mention of the political controversies into which Wycliffe entered with the Pope and his advocates, on behalf of the royal supremacy, and the right of the English nation to be exempt from the payment of Peter's pence, and other badges of subjection. This would have led us too far from our immediate subject, which was, to set before our readers a picture of the abuses of the Church of Rome in the fourteenth century, drawn from contemporaneous authors; and they will now be the better able to judge how far a reformation was needed. We would gladly have described the Reformer in the retirement of his parish at Lutterworth (to which he was presented by the Crown in 1375), and dwelt on the pure and Scriptural character of his teaching. Sundays and holidays he performed the offices of a diligent and edifying pastor. His people, probably, might at first have expected to hear of the good offices of the saints, or of the maternal influence and authority of the Blessed Virgin, who alone could secure the effective intercession of her Son, in behalf of transgression against the laws of the Father. Not a syllable of all this did they hear from the parson of Lutterworth. He refers directly and solely to the only Name given under heaven whereby men can be saved (Acts iv., 12), and this in language which might entirely become a Protestant pulpit at the present day. Above all, we would have wished to give some account of that immortal service performed for his country by Wycliffe, when he put forth his translation of the Bible in the English tongue; when (according to the reluctant testimony of Dr. Lingard) "the seeds were sown of that religious revolution which, in little more than a century, astonished and convulsed the nations of Europe." We do not desire, however, entirely to exhaust the patience of our readers, and, therefore, we must defer these interesting topics to some future opportunity.

The Reformer was finally taken to his rest on the 31st of December, 1384, in the sixty-first year of his age. Although he had, throughout his life, been the steadfast opponent of the Papacy, and although the friars and others whose wrath he had provoked frequently compassed his death by every variety of machination, yet he went to his grave in peace. "It was admirable," writes the quaint old historian, Fuller, "that a hare so often hunted with so many packs of dogs should die at last quietly sitting in his form." It may amuse our readers to read the epitaph which was composed for him by a monk. It is utterly undeserving of notice, except as affording a curious indication of the spirit of the age, and a strong testimony to the success of Wycliffe's aggressions on the monkish system. As far as hard words go, it would be difficult to surpass it in any language for bitter and malignant uncharitableness:—

"The devil's instrument, Church's enemy, people's confusion, heretic's idol, hypocrite's mirror, schism's broacher, hatred's sower, lie's forger, flattery's sink; who at his death despaired like Cain, and, stricken by the horrible judgments of God, breathed forth his wicked soul to the dark mansions of the black devil."

<sup>a</sup> The poet Chaucer, who was a contemporary of Wycliffe's, brings precisely the same charge against the clergy of his day—all of them, be it remembered, sworn servants of the Pope:—

"Christ's people they proudly curse

With broad book and braying bell.

To put penites in their purse

They will sell both heaven and hell."

When we read such statements, we may well ask, what good arises from the fact of a Church claiming infallibility, if the priests, who are the only channels through which this infallibility can flow to the people at large, convey poison to their flocks, instead of wholesome spiritual food?

The practices of these pardoners are described to the life by Chaucer:—

"His wallet before him in his lappe  
Brinful of pardons come from Rome all hot  
In his mail he had a pliwe-bere,  
Which, as he saide, was our Lady's veil.  
He said he had a goblet of the sail  
That St. Peter had, when he went  
Upon the sea, till Jesus Christ him hent (caught).  
He had a cross of laton full of stones.  
And in a glass he hadde pigge's bonea."

The whole passage is well worth consulting. Vide Prologue to the Canterbury Tales, p. 53.

<sup>b</sup> Church History, vol. II., p. 362. Oxford, 1845.

<sup>c</sup> Fuller, ut supra, p. 426.

In reply to these envenomed charges from an anonymous libeller, it may be deemed sufficient to quote part of a letter which was drawn up under the seal of the University of Oxford, in 1406, and laid before the Council of Constance, in defence of Wycliffe's character, about thirty years after his death. It affords the best proof how deeply his memory was honoured by a very large portion of the members of the University, who had the best opportunity of estimating his worth:—

"We signe unto you by these presents that his conversation even from his youth upwards unto the time of his death was so praiseworthy and honest, that never at any time was there any note or spot of suspicion noysed of him. But in his answering, reading, preaching, and determining, he behaved himself laudably, and as a stout and valiant champion of the faith, vanquishing by the force of the Scriptures all such who by their wilful beggary blasphemed and slandered Christ's religion. Neither was this said doctor convict of any heresie, either burned of our prelates after his buriall. God forbid that our prelates should have condemned a man of such honestie for a heretike; who, amongst all the rest of the Universite, had written in logicke, philosophie, divinitie, moralitie, and the speculative art, without peere (equal). The knowledge of which all and singuler things wee doe desire to testifie and deliver forth, to the intent that the fame and renoume of this said doctor may be the more evident and had in reputation amongst them into whose hands these present letters testimoniall shall come."

This high testimony to the learning, piety, and worth of the Reformer did not prevent the Council of Constance, however, from passing the decree which we quoted at the commencement of this article, for casting forth his bones out of consecrated ground—decree which the Bishop of Lincoln, as we have seen, carried into effect. But it is wisely remarked by the old Martyrologist—"There is no counsel against the Lord; for though they digged up his body, burned his bones, and drowned his ashes, yet the word of God and truth of his doctrine, with the fruit and success thereof, they could not burn, which yet to this day, for the most part of his articles, do remain."<sup>d</sup> "They cast his ashes," writes Fuller, "into Swift, a neigbouring brook running hard by. Thus, this brook hath conveyed his ashes into Avon, Avon into Severn, Severn into the narrow seas, they into the main ocean; and thus the ashes of Wycliffe are the emblem of his doctrine, which now is dispersed all the world over."<sup>e</sup>

#### THE SEE OF ST. PETER.—No. IV.

HAVING discussed, at some length, the question whether the Bishops of Rome are alone the successors of St. Peter, we now come to consider another proposition equally necessary (even if the former were decided in the affirmative) to support the supremacy claimed by the Church of Rome, viz.: Had St. Peter, by our Lord's appointment, a primacy implying a sovereignty of authority and jurisdiction over the rest of the Apostles? We are not disposed to deny that St. Peter may have excelled most, if not all, of the Apostles in personal endowments, which qualified him in an eminent manner for the discharge of the apostolic office, such as readiness of speech, boldness of spirit, love to our Lord, and zeal for his service, though it may well be doubted whether St. Paul is not his equal, at least, even in those qualities, as well as in resolution, activity, and industry. But the question is one essentially different from all this. St. Peter may have possessed a pre-eminence in talents or merit, which might have induced the other Apostles voluntarily to concede him that precedence which, even among equals, is due to those who indisputably excel others in good qualities or abilities, or even in age. The question is not whether St. Peter was, *primus inter pares*, first among equals, as one peer may excel the rest in the English senate, and still have no authority over them; but whether our Lord gave him such a primacy over the other Apostles as imparted superiority in power, command, or jurisdiction—which, in short, vested the supreme power in the Church in St. Peter alone? We think there are many grave reasons for believing that Christ did not appoint any such supremacy to St. Peter.

We shall presently consider the several texts of Holy Scripture relied upon as proofs that our Lord granted him such supreme authority; but we would first call our readers' attention to some observations which appear to us to be worthy of the consideration of those who honestly desire to arrive at truth in this important matter.

1st. If such a commission from God was really bestowed upon any one of the Apostles to the exclusion of the rest, it appears to us to be reasonable to suppose that it would have been granted in such plain and perspicuous terms, that no fair and honest mind could have any doubt or reasonable dispute with respect to it. If the Church of Rome be right it was the more indispensable, because it was not only necessary for the Apostles to bind and warrant their obedience to St. Peter personally as their chief, but necessary likewise for us and all mankind in after ages, as the sole foundation of our duty—a duty which we cannot heartily discharge without being assured of our obligation thereto by clear promulgation of God's will, either in the Holy Scriptures or some equally clear revelation.

<sup>f</sup> Le Bas, ut supra, p. 312.

<sup>g</sup> Fox, ut supra, vol. I., p. 606.

<sup>h</sup> Fuller, ut supra, p. 424.

2nd. If so illustrious an office was instituted by our Saviour, is it not strange that there should be no express mention of it in the evangelical or apostolical histories, which record at large many matters of much smaller moment? The time when St. Peter was invested with that authority—the manner and circumstances of his instalment in it—the nature, rules, and limits of such an all-important office, surely deserved, among other occurrences relating to faith and discipline, to have been specially noted by the Holy Evangelists. What point more concerned the whole Church to know, in the most clear and unambiguous manner, than a matter of such vast consequence as the establishment of a monarch in that Church, and a sovereign of the apostolic college, as St. Peter was, according to the advocates of Roman supremacy.

3rd. If St. Peter was instituted sovereign of the apostolical senate, differing from the rest as a king does from his subjects, and possessing not merely a temporary, personal, and incommunicable office, as the other Apostles did, but a standing, perpetual, successive office; is it not reasonable to suppose that our Lord would have designated it by some distinct name or title to characterise it and distinguish it from others, as that of arch apostle, arch pastor, high priest, sovereign pontiff, pope, his holiness, the vicar of Christ, or the like, as men in after times found it necessary to do, when ideas of supremacy arose which were apparently unknown in the Apostles' times? St. Peter, however, never claims or is given in the Holy Scriptures any such title, or any other title than that of Apostle; nor, indeed, was any office higher than that of Apostle known to the primitive Church. If there had been, could St. Paul have been ignorant of it, or so envious or negligent as to pass by without notice the supreme officer in the Church, if such an one then had been known to him? In his epistle to the Ephesians, when treating expressly of the Church "as one body and one spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism," St. Paul says, "He gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ;" and again, in writing to the Corinthians,—"And God set some in the churches, *first* Apostles, *secondarily* prophets, *thirdly* teachers." Why not first pope, an universal pastor, a vicar or vicegerent of Christ? Is it possible to believe that the office of supreme pontiff, or pope, was then existing and necessary for the perfection of the Church, and that St. Paul, in neither of these places, or in any other place, has taken the least notice of it? The early fathers also appear to have been equally ignorant of any such power or office in the Church. St. Chrysostom expressly asserts that "the greatest authority, and the top of authorities, is that of an Apostle; there was none before an Apostle—none superior, none equal to him;" and he particularly applies this to St. Paul.<sup>i</sup>

4th. The only other observation we shall here make, before proceeding to consider the arguments in favour of St. Peter's supremacy, is one which we think might well lead a candid mind to decide against any such pretension. It is this: that our Lord himself, on several occasions recorded in the Evangelists, declared against such a primacy, and seems to have instituted equality among his Apostles, by actually prohibiting them to affect or seek, to assume or admit, a superiority of power, one above another. Let us reverentially consider our Blessed Lord's conduct and words on these occasions.

St. Luke tells us (Douay Bible, chap. ix., ver. 44)—"And when they were in the house, He asked them, What did you treat of in the way? But they held their peace; for in the way they had disputed among themselves which of them should be the greatest. And sitting down, He called the twelve, and saith to them, If any man desire to be the first, he shall be the last of all, and the minister of all." In like manner, immediately after the institution of the Holy Eucharist, St. Luke tells us (Douay Bible, ch. xxii., v. 24): "And there was also strife amongst them which of them should seem to be greater. And He said to them, The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them, and they that have power over them are called beneficent. But be you not so; but he that is greater among you, let him become as the younger; and he that is the leader, as he that serveth."

Could anything more plainly show that He did not

<sup>j</sup> Ephes. ch. iv., v. 45, 11, 12. <sup>k</sup> 1 Corinth. ch. xii., v. 28.

<sup>l</sup> Ἀρχὴ μεγιστὴς κορυφὴ τῶν ἀρχέων. Chrys. Op. Tom. 3. Ben. Ed. 1721, p. 75 (p. 90, vol. 3. Paris, 1835). τὸ δὲ ἀκορδόλων τοῦ οὐδεὶς γίγνεται. Tom. 5., Or. 33.

intend to establish any superiority or jurisdiction of any one Apostle over the rest? but a perfect equality between them, and that the only superiority among them should be founded on superior humility. If anything were wanting either to establish such equality or to negative the idea that St. Peter was to be the greater, it is to be found, we think, in what immediately succeeds (v. 28, &c.)—“ You are they who have continued with Me in my temptations. And I dispose to you, as my Father hath disposed to Me, a kingdom; that you may eat and drink at my table, in my kingdom, and may sit upon thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.” That is, that each of the twelve Apostles should have a throne in his kingdom—not that St. Peter alone should have the rule—and immediately adds the voice of warning to St. Peter: “ And the Lord said, ‘ Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat; but I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not; and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren.’ Who said to Him, ‘ Lord, I am ready to go with thee both into prison and to death.’ And He said, ‘ I say to thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow this day till thou thrice denyest that thou knowest me.’” Does this look like a grant of supremacy to St. Peter?

In like manner, when, on another occasion, the mother of the sons of Zebedee, who were both Apostles of special worth and consideration, St. James and St. John, requested of our Lord that they should have the pre-eminence, St. Matthew tells us (Douay Bible, ch. xx., v. 24, &c.): “ And the ten hearing it were moved with indignation against the two brethren. But Jesus called them to Him, and said, ‘ You know that the princes of the Gentiles lord it over them; and they that are the greater exercise power upon them. It shall not be so among you; but whosoever will be the greater among you let him be your minister, and he that shall be first among you shall be your servant.’”

If our Lord had really intended to grant a superior or supreme power to St. Peter, was not this a fitting opportunity to announce it, especially as not doing so by almost necessary implication proved that He did not intend it? And can any one doubt that if Peter had, on this occasion, made a similar demand, he would have received a similar rebuke?

St. Matthew records, a little further on (ch. xxiii., v. 8-12), that our Lord cautioned his disciples not to follow the example of the Scribes and the Pharisees, who love the first chairs in the synagogues, and to be called by men Rabbi. “ But be not you called Rabbi; for one is your master, and all you are brethren. And call none your father upon earth, for one is your Father, who is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters; for one is your master, Christ. He that is the greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be humbled, and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted.”

How more pointedly could our Blessed Lord have declared the nature of his constitution, and the relation of his followers one towards another, so as to negative any such pre-eminence as that now claimed by the Bishops of Rome as the pretended successors of St. Peter—a power which exceeds anything that was ever claimed or usurped by the most absolute monarch upon earth, subjecting the very minds and consciences of men to his dictates, laws, and censures.

We might extend such observations as the foregoing much further, and may, perhaps, think it right to do so on some future occasion, but, for the present, we think what we have said is sufficient to enable our readers to estimate the real value of the arguments from certain passages in Scripture relied on by the advocates of the supremacy, which we shall probably proceed to the consideration of in our next number.

In the meantime, we would again recommend such of our readers as may desire to go further into the subject of the true position of St. Peter among the Apostles, to consult Barrow’s Treatise on the Supremacy, to which we have already referred them.

#### THE TRIAL AND MARTYRDOM OF CARNESECCHI.

“ Murder will out, they say.”

ANOTHER deed of darkness has come to light, after three hundred years concealment.

The proceedings of the Inquisition at Rome have hitherto been wrapt in profound obscurity, and the gentleness and charity of Papal Rome has been magnified by those who thought to conceal her deeds:—“ It is a remarkable thing that the Roman Inquisition has never been known to pronounce the execution of capital punishment, although the Apostolic See has been occupied during that time by Popes of extreme rigour and severity in all that relates to the civil administration. We find in all parts of Europe scaffolds prepared to punish crimes against religion; scenes which saddened the soul were everywhere witnessed. Rome is an exception to the rule—Rome, which it has been attempted to represent as a monster of intolerance and cruelty. It is true that the Popes have not preached, like the Protestants, universal toleration; but the facts show the difference between the Popes and the Protestants. The Popes, armed with a tribunal of intolerance, have not spilt a drop of blood. Protestants and philosophers have shed torrents.” Such is the statement of the Abbe Bal-

mez,<sup>a</sup> and it is adopted and relied on by Cardinal Wiseman, in the *Dublin Review*.<sup>b</sup>

Such a defence might serve its purpose, while the proceedings of the Roman Inquisition could be concealed; but now truth and murder at length comes out.

The original records of the Inquisition at Rome, or a great part of them, showing what was done in a number of cases in that dark tribunal, are now lodged in the library of Trinity College, Dublin.

Strange as this may seem, it is easily accounted for. Our readers may remember that in the Revolution of 1848, the dungeons of the Inquisition at Rome were ransacked by the Roman people, and long tresses of female hair dug up out of the lime in which the owners had been buried.

In like manner, in the wars of Napoleon I., the Inquisition at Rome had been plundered, and some officers of the French army got possession of the records, which were sold and brought to England, and which have lately been placed in the College library by the liberality of the vice-provost, Dr. Wall.

The Rev. Richard Gibbons, by whose care these records were recovered, and whose great learning is well known, has lately published from the original records a copy and translation of the trial and condemnation for heresy in the year 1567 of Pietro Carnesecchi, who had held the high office of secretary to Pope Clement VII., and Apostolic protonotary.

Pietro Carnesecchi was a man of high rank and family; his learning and integrity procured him universal respect; he was the friend of Cardinal Pole, Cardinal Gadolet, Cardinal Bembo, and of Pope Clement VII.

As Apostolic protonotary he was engaged in the chief administration of the Court of Rome, the abuses of which he endeavoured to restrain; but after the death of Clement VII. he retired in disgust from an office so little congenial to such a man.

It was well known that he was fully convinced that both the doctrines and the practices of the Church of Rome required to be reformed by the Word of God; and hence he was regarded with equal hatred and fear by those who resisted all reformation at that most critical period of the history of the Church of Rome, when she at length finally and formally adopted every popular error.

Four times he was accused before four Popes. Paul III. acquitted him; Paul IV. condemned him; but by some means he escaped. Pius IV. again acquitted him; but under Pius V., the sainted crusher of heretics, he was taken by treachery in the palace of Cosmo Medici, Grand Duke of Florence, upon a letter written by the Pope’s own hand,<sup>c</sup> condemned, and executed.

We shall now proceed to give from the report the crimes and heresies of which Carnesecchi was accused. We cannot find room for all, but we try and select the worst.

“ We, Bernardino de Trani, Scipione de Pisa, Francesco Pachecco, and Giovanni Francesco di Gambara, by divine mercy, Cardinals Presbyters of the holy Roman Church, . . . . and especially commissioned to act as Inquisitors General against heretical pravity in the entire Christian commonwealth by his holiness, our lord Pius V., by Divine Providence Pope.” . . . .

“ Because that you, Pietro Carnesecchi, a clergyman of Florence, formerly Apostolic protonotary, having been brought up in this Court of Rome, and largely endowed with dignities, ecclesiastical preferments, and emoluments, not having any esteem for the unspeakable truth of the holy Catholic faith, nor any reverence for the authority of the holy and apostolic Church of Rome, and reflecting not upon your rank, but wandering from the straight path of true salvation, have fallen into sundry heresies, in opposition to the said holy faith, and have held and believed many and various heretical and unsound opinions;—having, in the first place, from the year 1540, at Naples, been indoctrinated by the late Juan Valdes,<sup>d</sup> a Spaniard, as well as by Mark Antonio Flaminio,<sup>e</sup> and Bernardino Ochino, of Sienna, and having had intercourse with them, and with Peter Martyr,<sup>f</sup> and with Galeazzo Carrachiolo, and with many other heretics, and persons suspected of heresy, reading the book ‘of the benefit of Christ,’ and writings of the said Valdes.” . . . . Reading, in like manner, similar Lutheran and heretical books; . . . . and in other places in Italy you read the Institutes of Calvin. . . . . And without any concern or fear, you gave lodging, shelter, encouragement, and money to many apostates and heretics, who, on account of heresy, fled into the

<sup>a</sup> Protestantism compared with Catholicity, p. 166. London, James Burns, 1849.

<sup>b</sup> Dublin Review, June, 1850, p. 457.

<sup>c</sup> This letter is given by Mr. Gibbons, p. xv.

<sup>d</sup> This Juan Valdes was a distinguished jurisconsult in Spain, and a zealous and powerful advocate for a reformation in the doctrine and discipline of the Church of Rome.

<sup>e</sup> This Flaminio was one of the most distinguished scholars of that day. He was nominated by Pope Paul III. as secretary to the Council of Trent, but declined the office, “ because, perhaps, even at that period he favoured those (reformed) doctrines, in condemnation of which it would have been necessary for him to have then employed his pen.” (Pallavicini, Hist. c. T., lib. vi., c. 1.) Roman Catholics have endeavoured to deny the leaning of this great man to the cause of the Reformation; but we see now that a ter Flaminio was dead, the Inquisition thought that agreement with him was proof of heresy.

<sup>f</sup> Peter Martyr was a Florentine, and a monk of the order of St. Augustine. He was a man of great learning and ability, and much distinguished in the Reformation. When accused of heresy, Cardinal Pole defended him with the Pope. He left Italy, and was active in promoting the Reformation in other countries. He came to England, and was appointed Professor of Divinity at Oxford in the reign of Edward VI., from which he was afterwards expelled in the reign of Queen Mary.

countries of ultramontane heretics, and, according to your own admission, you recommended by letter, to a princess of Italy, two heretical apostates (they mean Protestants) with as much affection as if they had been two apostles sent to preach the faith to the Turks. . . . .

“ After having left Italy you went into France. . . . . We find that you in like manner held intercourse with several heretics, and with other notable persons suspected of heresy; and as well in Lyons, when you were going and returning, as at Paris and at its court, you read the ‘ Common Places’ of Melancthon, and other suspected books, and you introduced from Italy a book by Valdes, tintured with heresy, and presented it as a gift. . . . . You persevered in the perusal of books suspected and prohibited, and you received letters from sundry heretics of Geneva.”

“ . . . . Reading and having in your possession the Institutes of Calvin, and other heretical books; holding converse, eating and drinking with various heretics, and with other suspected persons, giving them assistance, countenance, and advice. . . . . You formerly deliberated upon eluding the just sentence of this holy tribunal, which you styled ‘ persecution for the cause of Christ;’ wishing, moreover, to come to an understanding with that most impious and most mischievous heresiarch, Calvin, and with other heretics, his associates, whom you are accustomed to call divines. . . . . Being of opinion that in Geneva they preached the Gospel more purely than our preachers here, and that they offered up more frequent and more fervent prayers than we, and that they applied themselves with greater assiduity to the study of the holy Scriptures, and that they also more often attended to the administration of the sacrament—that is, of the communion, than we did. . . . . You commanded several heretics, fugitives in Geneva, and in the other counties of the Lutherans, approving of their resoluteness, that they might freely live according to their consciences.”

“ In your letters you called the holy Catholic doctrine a false and superstitious religion . . . . . teaching that it was not a sin to keep possession of forbidden books; but an indifferent act, according to one’s conscience. . . . . And you were much displeased at the punishment and castigation of heretics, exhibiting great solicitude respecting those who were at that time imprisoned by the holy office (the Inquisition), especially about your own accomplices and friends, whom, also, when writing to others, you styled ‘ our innocent brethren,’ ‘ pious friends,’ and ‘ elect of God,’ making Him, the Lord God, the protector of heretics AND ACCUSED PERSONS, and desiring so earnestly that they should be set at liberty, that with all your ability you would have effected this object in any manner and by any means, even by assisting them to fly, if this had been possible, and consequently, with excessive bitterness and impetuosity you blamed the Pope, and the lords, the cardinals, inquisitors, and the holy office, taking offence at their authority.”

“ And, also, because that Henry, King of France, of illustrious memory, inflicted chastisement upon heretics, you ascribed some of his defeats, and even his death, which occurred afterwards, to the just vengeance of God.”

Such were the crimes charged against Carnesecchi. But that our readers may understand what is meant by “ heresy,” so often charged on him, we will give the charges made against his doctrine.

“ From the year 1540, and in succeeding years, you have held and believed the following propositions, which are, respectively, heretical, erroneous, rash, and scandalous:—

“ 1. Justification by faith alone, without the participation of our works therein.

“ 2. The certainty of grace and of salvation, according to the same Luther.

“ 3. That our works were not essential to salvation, which is to be obtained through faith; but that the justified man would inevitably perform them, whenever he shall have time and opportunity.

“ 4. And, consequently, that the said good works could not merit everlasting life, but should, indeed, be rewarded with a higher degree of glory after the general resurrection.

“ 5. You have held, concerning fasts, that it was not a mortal sin not to observe them, unless this omission should arise from contempt; but that they were useful for mortification only.

“ 6. That we have, by nature, a free will to do evil; and, before grace, only to commit sin.

“ 7. That it is not possible to keep the commandments in the decalogue, and, especially, the first two and the last, ‘ Thou shalt not covet,’ without the most effectual influence of the grace of God, and without a great abundance of faith and of the spirit, which is found but in few; and the case is not so with every ordinary Christian, but with the perfect—such as the holy martyrs and doctors of the Church have been.

“ 8. That we ought not to believe anything else than the word of God expressed in Holy Scripture.

“ 9. That not all general councils are assembled in the Holy Ghost; and, therefore, that we should not have faith in the decisions of them all; exercising a critical judgment as to which may be those assembled in the Holy Ghost; and questioning whether the power to convoke them belonged to the Emperor, to the Pope, or to others.

“ 10. You have been undecided respecting the number of the sacraments; having heard that Calvin held two,